

was given statehood within a few years. Another portion has not been admitted to statehood, although a century has elapsed—although doubtless it soon will be. In each case we showed the practical governmental genius of our race by devising methods suitable to meet the actual existing needs; not by insisting upon the application of some abstract shibboleth to all our new possessions alike, no matter how incongruous this application might sometimes be."

It will be noticed that in commending the system of expansion which our nation has heretofore followed he endeavors to work in an indirect defense of the policy which the administration has adopted in the Orient. It is evident that his reference to "some abstract shibboleth" is intended as a rebuke to those who insist upon the application of American principles to the Philippine question, and yet the Roman example which he condemns is really like our present Philippine policy.

The expansion of Jefferson was a totally different thing from imperialism. First, it included land not only contiguous to the United States, but so situated that its occupancy by an unfriendly nation would have seriously hampered the growth of our country. Second, it was a sparsely settled and uncultivated territory. Third, it was to be settled by our own people, and made a part of the United States. The Philippine islands are not only not near us, but are so remote from us and so situated as to be a source of weakness rather than a source of strength. Instead of being sparsely settled the population per square mile is greater in the Philippine islands than in the United States, which means that if we add the Philippines to our land, and their people to our people, there would be fewer acres for each citizen than there are today. Third, and most important, the Philippine islands are not to be settled by Americans, as the Louisiana territory was, but, if imperialism is to prevail, to be ruled by the Americans as Rome ruled her subjects. It will never be possible to make eight millions submit willingly to the government of a few thousand. At least, there is not a single example in history to justify the belief that they will welcome a foreign ruler. Canada, Australia and New Zealand cannot be cited in defense of our present policy in the Philippines, first, because the inhabitants of these English colonies are largely descendants of Englishmen, and therefore attached to England by ties of blood, and, second, because England does not attempt to make their laws for them or to tax them. If England attempted to do in Canada, Australia or New Zealand what we are now doing in the Philippines, she would not hold the colonies long, notwithstanding the blood relationship.

The president persistently refuses to consider the real question involved in the Philippine policy, namely, the theory of government to be applied. Is this an "abstract shibboleth?" Our home government rests upon the theory set forth in the Declaration of Independence, our colonial policy rests upon the European theory of government which our revolutionary patriots successfully resisted. A colonial government would ultimately destroy the doctrine of self-government in the United States, for we could not permanently assert the principles of the Declaration of Independence here and deny them abroad. If, on the other hand, the present policy in the Philippines is only intended to be temporary, if the purpose is to make the Philippine islands a part of the United States as the Louisiana purchase was made a part, and the Filipino citizens, as the inhabitants of the Louisiana territory were made citizens, then while avoiding danger to our theory of government we would encounter another danger which is appalling, namely, the demoralizing influence of Filipino states upon our government and destiny. The Filipinos are separated from us by an ocean which places them in another hemisphere and adjacent to other nations. Their history, race and language, make it impossible for them to act intelligently upon our affairs or for us to act intelligently upon their affairs, and the objections to incorporation are so great that nearly all the republicans who voted for the ratification of the treaty voted for a resolution which declared that the Philippine islands were not to become an integral part of the United States.

While the president talks of expansion and intimates that a nation must continue to grow in territory if it is to be a great nation, he avoids the vital questions raised by his Philippine policy. His argument in regard to the necessity of continuing expansion is absurd, for it means that the United States must continue to take in new territory until it has all there is in the world, and then must die because there are no

more worlds to conquer. Constant expansion is not essential to greatness.

Every proposed extension of our territory must rest upon its own merits, and in deciding whether it is wise or unwise, we must consider both the wishes of our own people and the wishes of the people to be incorporated. Our system of national unity, combined with local self-government, makes it possible for the United States to include an indefinite area of land so long as the people are homogeneous, but it is essential that the national unity shall be not merely a unity in government, but a unity in sympathy and in purpose. Jefferson regarded the North American continent as the natural home of the American republic. He believed that we could extend our borders throughout North America without endangering our form of government. Our theory of government is applicable to all the world, but it is far better that there should be several separate republics administering their own affairs and arbitrating their differences, than one republic with elements so antagonistic as to be warring with each other.

Our nation has demonstrated the correctness of our theory of government and it has inspired other nations to attempt the same experiment. It ought never to weaken its influence by a policy that casts suspicion upon its faith in equal rights and self-government. Our nation is under no compulsion to sacrifice its own ideals, even if by doing so it could hope to force undesired blessings upon a resisting people. Experience shows, however, that you can help people by raising their ideals, not by crushing their aspirations. The expansion of Jefferson was democratic and entirely in keeping with our form of government; republican imperialism is antagonistic to every principle of a republic and a menace to the nation's welfare.

Does It Dare Answer?

The Nashville American seems to resent the suggestion made by The Commoner that it is a republican paper in disguise. It responds in the following choice language:

Yet there is a wild ass of the Nebraska plains who with the practiced ease of an untruthful pen and a slanderous lip denounces as republican organs and subservient tools of monopoly those newspapers which have the intelligence and the courage to declare against a continuation of the absolute folly which has led the party into such disaster. The unfairness, the injustice, the downright falsehood of such charges ought to condemn their author to the perpetual and profound contempt of the general public.

If The Commoner has done the American injustice it will be glad to acknowledge the same, but it does not believe that the American has been misrepresented. To settle the question the following offer is made: If the American will publish upon its editorial page the names of its three largest stockholders, with the amount of their holdings, their business and sources of income, and state how they voted in the national elections of 1896 and 1900, and will also give the names of its three most prominent editorial writers, and state how they voted in those elections, The Commoner will be glad to republish such an editorial and withdraw its charges if the American's own statement shows that those who control its policy and speak through its columns are really democrats and in sympathy with the general public. Surely the American ought not to be ashamed to reveal the identity of those who own it and speak for it.

Municipal Ownership Wins.

On another page will be found a copy of the Mueller municipal ownership bill, which Governor Yates now has under consideration. It will be remembered that this bill figured conspicuously in the Chicago city election. Mayor Harrison tried to secure the passage of the measure before the election, and asked Mr. Stuart, his republican opponent, to join with him in the effort. While Stuart claimed to favor the bill it was evident that the republican leaders did not want it passed and it was postponed until after the election. Then the speaker, who seemed to be under orders from the traction companies, tried to prevent its passage and his outrageous unfairness resulted in a riot in the house, during which he declared the house adjourned and escaped to another room. A majority of the legislature remained and took charge of the body. Finally an agreement was

reached whereby the bill was put to a vote and passed.

The advocates of municipal ownership have reason to rejoice over the issue of this fight. The fact that the second city in the United States should vote for the municipal ownership of the street car lines is in itself strongly indicative of the growth of sentiment in favor of the right of the people of a city to attend to their own business without the aid of syndicates and public service corporations. That the sentiment was so strong as to force a republican legislature, in one of the greatest states of the Union, to pass this bill, is still more significant. The democrats supported the Mueller bill and furnished most of the votes to pass it, but as the republicans had a majority in the legislature the republicans who voted with the democrats deserve as much credit as the democrats do. It only shows that when a cause gets strong it breaks down party lines and makes a new alignment on that issue.

Why Silver Is Coined.

A reader of The Commoner asks by what law silver is coined since the repeal of the Sherman law. The government is now coining (has almost finished) the seigniorage that accumulated under the Sherman law. The Sherman law provided that silver should be bought at the market price and certificates issued therefor. The difference between the market price and the coinage price was called seigniorage and was held as silver bullion. The Sherman law also provided that so much of the purchased silver should be coined as was necessary to redeem certificates presented. The act of 1898 required the coinage of the seigniorage and also the coinage of the silver held for the redemption of the Sherman certificates. When this silver is coined coinage will cease, as there is now no provision for the purchase of further silver except for subsidiary coinage. A bill passed the lower house of the last congress authorizing the recoinage of silver dollars into subsidiary coin. If this bill ever becomes a law it will make it unnecessary for the government to buy silver for a century to come, and at the same time the volume of standard money will be reduced to the extent that the silver dollars are recoinced into fractional currency.

Three Questions Answered.

A reader of The Commoner asks three questions:

First—What provision is made to insure retirement of national bank notes when the bonds upon which they are issued have matured or have been redeemed?

Second—Can any state bank issue notes for circulation within the borders of the state?

Third—Would it be possible for the banks to organize a boycott against silver and silver certificates in case silver was restored?

Answer to the first: If the bank is using bonds at the time of the maturity of the bonds it can withdraw them and substitute other bonds. As bank notes today rest upon bonds they would have to be retired if all the bonds were redeemed and cancelled.

Answer to the second: A state bank can issue notes, but those notes are subject to a 10 per cent tax. It was intended to be prohibitory, and has proven so.

Answer to the third: The banks would not find it to their interest to boycott silver. The banks are so dependent upon the government that they could not afford, and would not attempt, to oppose the policy of the party in power.

Democratic Clubs.

The organization of democratic clubs is proceeding at a gratifying rate.

Among those whose organization have been reported to The Commoner are the following:

The "Democratic Club," Bentonville, Ark.: J. D. Parkalow, secretary. The club begins with eighty members.

The "William R. Hearst Club," St. Louis. The club begins with 150 members.

The "Bryan Club," Weston Township, York, Neb. Twenty-five members. G. W. Gilmore, president; Henry Schultz, secretary.

The "Jefferson Club," East Greenville, Pa.: J. L. Dimmig, president; Dan W. Garber, corresponding secretary.

The "Jefferson Democratic Club," of the University of Maine, School of Law, Bangor, Me. Fourteen members. Lewis S. Record, president; Leon G. C. Brown, secretary.